



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JE IN THE MIDDLE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.*

ANALYSIS OF EXODUS VII.—XII.

BY BENJAMIN WISNER BACON.

THE analysis of the story of the plagues, which properly extends (xi. 1) from Ex. vii. 8 to xii. 36, is admitted to be but a partially solved problem. P's portion may be defined as vii. 8–13, 19, 20 first clause, 21 last clause, 22; viii. 1–3, 11 from יֵלֵךְ on (supplying פִּרְעֹה לֵב פִּרְעֹה), 12–15; ix. 8–12; xi. 9, 10; xii. 1–13, 28.[†]

Of this xi. 9, 10 is due no doubt to R, and there is a very slight disagreement amongst critics as to other parts. Among the five whose analyses are tabulated in my article, "Pentateuch Analysis," *Hebraica*, iv. 4, Wellhausen differs only by adding vii. 23, apparently by inadvertence, since vii. 22^b concludes P's account of the 'wonder,' and makes verse 23 superfluous. Further reasons for assigning vii. 23 to JE are given by Jülicher.¹

Kuenen differs in assigning P the whole of vii. 20 (*Hex.* p. 70). The first clause of verse 20 is, of course, P's relation of the performance of the command of verse 19, and 21^c describes the promised result: "The blood was throughout all the land of Egypt,"² but 20^b is not the fulfilment of Yahweh's command according to P, as it appears in verse 19, but as it appears in verses 15 and 17, i.e. in JE, confirmed by xvii. 5^b. "Stretching out the hand over the rivers, pools, ponds," etc., is not the same thing as "lifting up the rod and

* Read in May 1890.

† [In following this analysis with the English Bible, it will be borne in mind that vii. 26–29 are in the English viii. 1–4; and that throughout chap. viii. the corresponding verses of the English will be found by adding four to the numbers in the text.]

¹ *Die Quellen von Ex. i.–vii.* 7. Halle, 1880; which I shall speak of as Jül. A, and *Die Quellen von Ex. vii. 8.–xxiv.* 11, *Jahrbüch. f. Prot. Theol.* viii. 79–127, 272–315, designated by Jül. B.

² Kittel's omission of this clause, 21^c, from his tabulation of P appears from a comparison of his J and E to be a simple misprint.

smiting the river in the sight of Pharaoh." Kuenen also differs in assigning — and why I know not — אלהם in ix. 12 to R, and suggesting that כִּאֲשֶׁר רֹבַר יְהוָה בִּיד מִשָּׁח may be a trace of P. For this also I can see no ground, since P is absolutely complete without it, and adding it produces an exact reduplication of the clause next preceding, viz. ix. 12^b. R must certainly be responsible for it.

Kittel differs in failing to divide the verse viii. 11, — perhaps by oversight. The necessity is apparent from the phrase "Pharaoh saw that there was respite," referring to verse 9 (J E).

With these minute divergences, there is exact agreement among critics as to the P element. It is when we have lifted off this narrative from what is generally considered its bed of older conglomerate that we attack the real problem — a problem from which we are even dissuaded by two of the greatest of critics. Says Wellhausen: ³ "Auf eine genaue Scheidung von J und E in Nr. 1. 2 (?) 5. 6 (i.e. the plague narratives enumerated in this order) wird man besser verzichten." Kuenen concludes a judicious critique of his predecessors' work with the words: "In Ex. iii. 16–xii. we may find abundant points of support for a critical analysis; but here we cannot separate two distinct documents, as we have done in Jacob's biography and elsewhere, and assign its share to each with confidence. The most we can hope for is to determine whether it is E or J that lies at the basis of the narrative, and sometimes even this is doubtful. . . . It appears that in Ex. i. sqq. the simple interweaving of the authorities with the retention of the special characteristics of each, gave way to their free use, and their intimate blending and recasting."⁴

As a preliminary to the analysis of JE in the Middle Books this paper is submitted, in the hope of showing that the separation of J and E in the plague chapters is both feasible and valuable. Perhaps no critic regards the prophetic element as a single, self-consistent whole, even in these chapters where, in Kuenen's opinion, "the simple interweaving of authorities . . . gave way to their free use." There is even an effort on the part of the French critic, Bruston, to trace a second Jehovist (more properly Jahvist); but that is a perfectly just demand which is made by Mr. Vos in his "Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes," that no analysis shall be attempted unless some *prima facie* evidence exists of the composite character of the text.

³ *Compos. d. Hexateuchs*, Berlin, 1889, p. 69.

⁴ *The Hexateuch*, § 8, n. 11.

So far as I know, it is the invariable method of critics first to show good reason for suspecting the presence of two or more diverse accounts, and afterward proceed with their disentanglement of the strands. Without dwelling longer than necessary upon proofs of the existence of two accounts here, which to many may seem superfluous; without, on the other hand, resting any weight upon the *a priori* probability that the documents J and E did not interrupt their narrative just at the point which forms the sacred history *par excellence*, of how Yahweh brought his people out of Egypt, I will briefly refer to one or two incongruities, which will at the same time show the composite character of the present narrative, and illustrate some of the fundamental peculiarities of each part.

iv. 17 is a command to Moses, "Take in thine hand this rod, wherewith thou shalt do the signs." The signs referred to are not the signs of the passage iv. 1-9, for only one of these can be performed with the use of the rod. They are undoubtedly the signs to be performed before Pharaoh. As a matter of fact, we find the "rod of God" so employed in smiting the river in the sight of Pharaoh and his servants, and summoning the hail, the locusts, and the darkness. Not only this; but in a part of the prophetic narratives it appears regularly as the means by which Moses secures supernatural intervention for the relief of the people. With the "rod of God" the rock is smitten at Meribah (Ex. xvii. 6 and Num. xx. 11). With the rod a passage is opened across the Red Sea (Ex. xiv. 16), and victory is obtained over the Amalekites (Ex. xvii. 8 ff.). I need hardly say that in all these passages there are other indications so conclusively pointing to E as the author, that there is no difference of opinion in any case among the critics, although all of them seem to recognize the rod as an element in J's story (Ex. iv. 1 ff.), and hence would have no *a priori* reason for rejecting these passages from J.

The signs, then, are to be wrought with the "rod of God," which, it is expressly mentioned, Moses took with him to Egypt (iv. 20). But are they so wrought? Some are, and more are not. In most of the plagues Moses' function is simply that of ambassador from Yahweh to Pharaoh, to present the ultimatum, announce what Yahweh will do and when; then, after Yahweh by the means of wind or hail or pestilence has intervened, and Pharaoh momentarily succumbs, to return to Yahweh as intercessor on the vacillating monarch's behalf. It should be observed here, that this is not a mere *argumentum e silentio*. The rod

s not passed over in silence, but excluded. There is no room to insert the rod in the "doing of the signs." In the usual form of narrative, Moses in Pharaoh's presence "appointed a set time, saying, To-morrow shall Yahweh do this thing in the land." Certainly the rod has no function here. Again, e.g. after Yahweh smote the cattle, Pharaoh sent out to see whether the destruction by murrain had taken place as announced, or not. Are we to suppose that in the meantime Moses had gone out, alone by himself, and pointed the rod at the cattle?

In a second category of signs, Moses appears wielding the rod, in addition to his presentation of Yahweh's ultimatum. In one, Moses' function of ambassador from Yahweh to Pharaoh disappears entirely. He simply receives the command (x. 21 ff.) to stretch forth his hand (ix. 22, 23; x. 12, 13; xiv. 16, 21 show that we should supply "with the rod") toward heaven for the darkness; he obeys, and the plague comes unannounced save for the gesture, and immediately after it.

We have thus three classes of narratives in JE: 1st, those in which Moses announces what Yahweh is going to do, and no rod is brought into play; 2d, those in which there is no announcement, but the rod of Moses summons the plague upon the spot; 3d, those of mixed character. The existence of the first two classes, — one set in which Moses is a mere ambassador, another in which he is an agent wielding the rod of God, — in connection with iv. 17, might suffice to establish duality; but it is the third class which brings complete demonstration. In the narratives of mixed character will the two elements harmonize? Or do they, as the French say, swear at each other?

vii. 14-25 is the first. We ask here, is it Moses or Yahweh who smites the river? Verse 25 says positively that it was Yahweh, as the first part of verse 17 unmistakably implies: "Thus saith Yahweh, Behold I will smite" (cf. vii. 27, "Behold I will smite," where the subject is Yahweh; viii. 17, "Behold I will send"; ix. 3, "Behold the hand of Yahweh is upon thy cattle." Cf. ix. 18; x. 4; xi. 4; xii. 29). But does the next clause of verse 17, "with the rod that is in mine hand," refer to Yahweh? Does 20^b, "And he lifted up the rod and smote the waters," refer to Yahweh? Or, grant with Kuenen that this belongs to P, who smote the river according to xvii. 5?

The next plague where the rod appears is the hail. Moses is com-

manded to stretch forth his hand for hail upon man and upon beast throughout the land of Egypt. He stretched forth his *rod*, and Yahweh sent thunder, hail, and fire. "And the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt, all that was in the field, both man and beast" (ix. 22 f., 25). How does this harmonize with ix. 6, which states that all the cattle of Egypt were already dead of the murrain? And is it not superfluous, after having said in verse 23^b, "And Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven, and Yahweh sent thunder and hail, and fire ran down unto the 'earth,'" to say in the next clause, "And Yahweh rained hail upon the land of Egypt, and fire mingled with the hail"?

The next passage involving both characteristics is x. 1-15. In vs. 12 ff. appears the rod. After the usual command (vs. 13), "Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and Yahweh brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all the night; and when it was morning the east wind brought the locusts." Did Moses stand out in the east wind all that day and all the night, with his rod pointed to the sky, until at last in the morning the east wind brought the locusts? Or did he stretch forth his rod for the locusts, and nothing happen for twenty-four hours? ⁵

This includes all the "mixed" plague narratives, which combine the characteristics of the rod agency required by iv. 17, and the ambassadorial functions which appear in the first class. I think that the epithet "mixed" is justified, and, further, that by the consideration of the class of narratives in which Moses appears simply as ambassador, not as agent, the class in which he figures as agent but not ambassador, and finally the self-contradictory character of the passages where both characteristics appear, the double origin of JE is conclusively demonstrated. If more proof were wanted, we might take the passage xi. 1-3, which by separating x. 28 f. from xi. 4-8 brings the latter into flat contradiction to the former; or we might ask how this passage, which implies that the Hebrews dwelt intermingled with the Egyptians, supported as it is by iii. 22 and x. 23, is to be reconciled with viii. 18, ix. 7, 26, and other JE passages which state or imply

⁵ The *a priori* probability that the summons by the rod required an immediate response, in contrast with the twenty-four hours' delay of the present text, is confirmed by the contrasted use of language in the portions assigned respectively to J and E. J says Yahweh brought an east wind, and in the morning the east wind brought the locust. E says "Moses stretched forth his rod, and the locusts rose up (וַיָּרֹא) all over the land of Egypt."

that the Hebrews dwelt in a land apart from the Egyptians by themselves.

The duplicate character of J E being established, none will dispute the fact that the main narrative is J, or at least rests upon the basis of that graphic, vivid story.⁶ The briefer account, characterized by the rod of God, is also universally conceded to be E, on account of the later E passages, in which the rod of God appears in the same way.

To begin immediately with the stone of stumbling of the critics, let us take up the passage x. 21-27, which Wellhausen rejoices to recognize as a pure example of E's mode of relating the plagues: "Durch einen glücklichen Umstand trifft es sich, dass die zweite Quelle des Jehovisten, von der sich bisher nur eben die Spur verfolgen liess, zuletzt rein und nicht mit J vermenget erscheint, nämlich in x. 21-27 (ägyptische Finsterniss)."⁷ In point of fact, x. 21-23, the command and its fulfilment by Moses are precisely in the form of the rod passages which we have already referred to. "Stretch out thine hand toward heaven," etc., "and Moses stretched forth his hand" with the predicted result (cf. ix. 22 f.; x. 12 f.; xiv. 16, 21; xvii. 5 f.). Verse 23^b confirms the assignment to E by its implication that the dwellings of the children of Israel are in the midst of the Egyptians. J separates "the land of Goshen." There is not a superfluous word; every clause bears the stamp of E. But why attribute verses 24-26 to E? Dillmann has a reason which seems to him sufficient to sustain all the weight not only of this passage, but also of its correlates, viii. 21-24 x. 7-11; xii. 32, 38. He gives the following as if it were sufficient and conclusive: "Ueber dem allem ergibt x. 24-27, verglichen mit xi. 1 (citing the clauses "Yet one plague more will I bring," and

⁶ Kuenen, *Hex.* § 8 n. 11. "The accounts in which Yahweh himself sends the plagues and makes Moses announce them come from J, though perhaps in a more primitive form than they have now assumed." I defer for the present the question of the primitive form of J, merely remarking that there are several unmistakable touches of didactic (Deuteronomic) redaction in the J elements which will be pointed out, and that while on the one hand the supreme importance and interest of the story of the deliverance from the "house of bondage" would no doubt lead to more frequent interpolation, the great antiquity of the plague tradition seems to be vouched for both by E and by Gen. xii. 10-20.

⁷ *Compos. d. Hex.*, p. 68. I sincerely beg Prof. Wellhausen's pardon for crediting him by mistake with some of my own analytical work. In the article *Pent. Analysis*, Heb. iv. 4, p. 230, n. 64, I have given as Wellhausen's the analysis I am now supporting, which is original with myself. In referring to my notes at the time of writing the article I accidentally confused his analysis with my own.

“shall surely thrust you out altogether”), dass es B ursprünglich war, welcher nach den einzelnen Plagen den Pharao immer grössere Zugeständnisse machen liess”; i.e. the כלה “altogether,” must be understood as the climax of the partial permissions of the passages alluded to. The whole force of this argument entirely disappears when we bring xi. 1 into connection with another passage which is not open to question, as viii. 21–24, etc. are, but is indisputably by E, the author of xi. 1: viz. (iii. 19 f.?) v. 1, and read the כלה in the more natural sense “completely,” “for good and all.” To express the meaning Dillmann attributes to xi. 1, we should not have the last clause at all, but the כלה would simply be added to the second clause, “afterwards he will let you go hence כלה,” i.e. without limitation. But the contrast is not between כלה, and x. 24–27; the real contrast is in the verb “thrust”; hence we have an independent clause attached, “When he shall let you go, he shall surely *thrust* you out altogether,” i.e. will not merely give you the temporary leave of absence asked for (v. 1), but will drive you out for good and all. This verse is the fulfilment of the promise vi. 1, which we shall find to be E’s.

With the elimination of this argument of Dillmann’s disappears the only evidence adduced, so far as I know, for assigning x. 24–26 to E. The mere fact that these verses happen to be included between verses 23 and 27, which are E’s, argues nothing; since, from the very nature of their content, verses 24–26, even if J’s, had to be inserted here or not at all. They could not follow verse 27, and they were not allowed to remain in their original position after verse 19, because, as they manifestly represent the last stage of diplomatic relations between Moses and Pharaoh, they must immediately precede the last hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (vs. 27), and not the next to last (vs. 20).

The only other argument I have met with is the very obvious connection of this passage with viii. 21–24; x. 7–11; xii. 32 and 38, which is employed in one instance (Jüllicher, viii. 21–24 = E) as proof for all the other passages. Now each several one of these passages can be proved separately and independently to belong to J — a task which I reserve for myself later on. The references are, indeed, very convincing, but they work a result just contrary to that desired. For the present, all we can say is, that these five passages stand or fall together. If one is E’s, all are E’s; if one is J’s, all are J’s. What I undertake to show is, that each several one is, on independent grounds, J’s — the voice of all the critics to the contrary notwithstanding.

If these passages are to be assigned to E, it follows that the rod narratives had also, like those of J, an account of diplomatic intercourse with Pharaoh. Moses was not simply an agent, to "do the signs" (iv. 19) with the "rod of God," as in xvii. 9 ff., but an ambassador plenipotentiary. Outside of the passages in dispute, there is absolutely nothing in E to give color to this idea. The nearest approach to it is in the first plague story, where the directions for Moses' actions are necessarily most explicit. There he is commanded to go to meet Pharaoh, who will be found going out to the water. Standing on the brink of the river, in the sight of Pharaoh and his servants (cf. vs. 20), he is to smite the waters of the river with the rod, and they thereupon will be changed to blood. There is just one letter that seems to point to an address on Moses' part to Pharaoh — the letter ם after ך, in the latter part of vs. 17, instead of ך. But we have already seen that the ם makes simple nonsense. When, however, a verb in the first person. "I will smite," was substituted for one in the second, "Thou shalt smite," this change of ך׃ to ך׃ was of course made necessary. Wellhausen suggests that possibly the words "I will smite" may be understood — of course when separated from the first part of the verse — as addressed by Moses to Pharaoh; but there is no need for any address in E. The demand of Yahweh has been formulated, and peremptorily refused by Pharaoh (i. 1 f.). What remains now (cf. v. 4; vi. 1) is to "do a sign" with the rod (iv. 17). There is not a trace of any verbal communication whatever between Moses and Pharaoh in any portion assigned to E, between chap. v. and xii. 31. It does not appear that Moses even comes within speaking distance. His message is addressed to the eye, not the ear; and it is more impressive without language than with. It is simply done "in the sight of Pharaoh and of his servants" (vii. 20). But not merely is there no reason to suppose any verbal intercourse after chap. v. between Pharaoh and Moses. I expect to show reason for attributing v. 4 to E, and this verse, taken strictly, is the counterpart to x. 28 in J. It denies further audience on the subject.

Instead, then, of finding x. 24–26 and kindred passages "excellently agreeing with E's point of view," as one of the critics has it,⁸ we find their representation entirely to disagree both with the form of E's narrative elsewhere and with the situation as he conceived it. I cannot anticipate here the detailed analysis to be presented in the pages which

⁸ Jülicher B, p. 89.

follow; but we have already found the grounds for separating a J and an E version of the plagues, and may fairly rest upon the characteristics which are by general consent attributed to E. In E the representation seems to be as follows: Ex. iii. 10, Moses is sent to Pharaoh to bring the people forth from Egypt, and the promise is given (iii. 12) that when they have been brought forth they shall serve God on Mt. Horeb. They shall not go empty, but laden with the spoils of the Egyptians (iii. 21 f.). Moses next goes to Pharaoh and asks the release of the people that they may hold a feast to Yahweh in the wilderness (v. 1). The demand is peremptorily refused (v. 2). Israel rebels. From this time on what is sought is not merely leave of absence but complete release (vi. 1). The next step is the accumulating plagues (iv. 17), the result of which will be, as Yahweh says to Moses (vi. 1), that Pharaoh will not merely give them leave to hold a feast, but will surely thrust them out altogether. The conception of Pharaoh's character here is the exact opposite of that in J. Here he is stubborn, obstinate, immovable. Hence the ineffectualness of the plagues to move him is described by the use of וַיִּסָּר, and not כָּבֵד. "Pharaoh turned and went into his house, neither did he lay even this to heart," is the description of the result of the first plague. After every other, "Pharaoh's heart was *strong*" (or "Yahweh made his heart strong"). From the proud, peremptory refusal (v. 1 f.) till he thrusts Israel out altogether, there is not a trace of weakening on Pharaoh's part. It is admittedly J's Pharaoh who cringes after every stroke, begs forgiveness, "deals deceitfully," and consents to be accused of it by Moses (viii. 25) in so many words. If we must choose between E's "strong-hearted" Pharaoh, who never bends till he breaks, and J's vacillating, weak-minded, deceitful, abject creature, whose heart is only "heavy" when most resolute, it should not be hard to say with which the stories of compromising and concession belonged; even if we had not the additional hint that there is no indication of any verbal intercourse whatever in E. This appears to be the bearing of the argument that the subject matter of x. 24-26 and kindred passages agrees with E better than with J, when pressed for its real meaning. Argument for any of these passages on linguistic ground there is none. The only critic who alludes to their linguistic marks (Jülicher) confesses, as we shall see in considering viii. 21 ff., that the language is more like J than E.

If x. 24-26 and kindred passages belonged to E, they would

therefore seem strangely anomalous; but not only is there nothing at all to suggest their derivation from this source, there is every proof one could wish that they belong to J. The last words of J's narrative before verse 24 are those of verse 19 (verse 20 is E's invariable formula concluding his narrative of a plague, and his only; J invariably uses כָּבַד). Pharaoh has once more temporarily succumbed. On his abject plea Moses intercedes, and Yahweh drives away the locusts. We wait to hear the result; but if we take away verses 24–26, the next we read is verse 28 (verse 27 being E; cf. verse 20): "And Pharaoh said unto him, Get thee from me," etc. How comes Moses back in Pharaoh's presence? We have to supply the regular formula of J: "And Pharaoh called for Moses, and said, Go ye," etc.; in other words, just what we have in verse 24. And how comes Pharaoh to be ordering Moses off in a rage? We can only account for it by supposing that Moses has insisted peremptorily on the full letter of his ultimatum; in other words, something exactly like verses 25 and 26. In brief, verses 24–26 are superfluous, if not incongruous, in E, whereas they have actually to be supplied if withdrawn from J. Nothing could add to the strength of the argument from connection except an independent proof that the kindred passages, viii. 21 ff. and the rest, are J's. This I shall supply when the passages are reached in their order.

But Jülicher, followed by Kittel, would assign 28 f., as well as 20–27, to E. This also rests on no linguistic criteria, but is necessitated by the obvious connection of 28 f. with 24–26. The only characteristic of style or language in 28 f. alluded to by any critic is Dillmann's reference to Gen. ii. 17 compared with verse 28^b, a good piece of evidence for J.

To enable him to assign x. 28 f. to E, Jülicher is obliged to deny positively any connection between these verses and the section xi. 4–8, which it is totally impossible to assign to any author but J. Except in the case of verse 8, I judge that this assignment of xi. 4–8 will be undisputed; hence I defer for the present detailed consideration of the passage, pointing only to the previous warnings to Pharaoh, couched in precisely analogous terms, of which we have six preceding examples in J, and not the shadow or trace of one in E. As regards verse 8, Jülicher and Kittel are in flat contradiction. Kittel stakes all his reputation as a critic (*Gesch.* p. 186) on the relation of xi. 8 to x. 28 f., and hence draws a line of division between xi. 7 and 8. Jülicher sees

clearly the impossibility of isolating xi. 8 from the passage xi. 4-8, and is as blind as the proverbial man who will not see, to the connection which Kittel feels compelled to recognize in common with all other critics. So strongly, indeed, does he feel it, that he reluctantly draws the unnatural line of division between xi. 7 and 8. Moses' "hot anger" (cf. J, Num. xi. 1-3; Ex. iv. 14 (?), etc.) is indeed the fitting and necessary climax of xi. 4-7, which is simply decapitated by the abstraction of verse 8; so that Jülicher is right in seeing the connection of xi. 8 with verses 4-7; but it is certainly not "psychologisch genügend motivirt" if severed from x. 28 f., and so made the mere effect of Moses' own rhetoric. So Kittel is right in insisting upon the unavoidable connection of xi. 8 and x. 28 f.

A further objection to either of the courses proposed by these two critics is, that by depriving one of the interviews with Pharaoh of its conclusion to make a new interview, they leave one of their supposed interviews without the conclusion we expect from previous analogy, and the other without the still more indispensable and invariable introduction. Says Jülicher (B. p. 98), "Nachher bei J auch die Heuschrecken nicht geholfen haben, geht Mose, xi. 4, zu Pharaoh." That is indeed what *ought* to be in xi. 4 by unbroken analogy, together with a great deal more in the way of direction from Yahweh, if xi. 4-8 is what Jülicher supposes it to be, viz. a separate interview from that narrated in x. 24-26, 28 f.; but that is precisely what does *not* stand in xi. 4, nor anywhere else. To effect the separation a new conclusion, other than xi. 8, must be manufactured for the interview x. 24-26, 28 f., which leaves Moses in Pharaoh's presence, still speaking;⁹ and a new beginning of very considerable proportions for the (supposed new) interview xi. 4-8, which finds him again just where we left him. The objection is fatal both to Jülicher's and Kittel's proposal; x. 28 f. and xi. 4-8 are inseparable, and consequently J's. This of itself makes it inevitable, so far as I can see, to assign x. 24-26 also to J, for reasons above stated; but as critics like Dillmann and Wellhausen have not seen it, it is perhaps not superfluous to add that even the linguistic and stylistic marks of the verses in question are, without exception, in J's favor.

It is Dillmann himself who shows us (*Ex. und Lev.* p. 65) that עבר with יחיה expressed or understood in these chapters is a mark of J.

⁹ The words מִשְׁחָר מִיָּאֲמֹר in xi. 4 are superfluous, and may have been added by the redactor, who broke the connection by inserting xi. 1-3.

It occurs three times in these three short verses. The phrase "And Pharaoh called for Moses" is J's regular formula after the alteration of Pharaoh's mind (cf. viii. 4, 21; ix. 27). Compare verse 25 (וַיִּבֶחַ, וַעֲשִׂינִי, etc.) with iii. 18; v. 3, 8; viii. 4, all acknowledged J passages, except that Dillmann does not recognize iii. 18. (See in contrast E in iii. 12; v. 1.) In verse 26 observe the colloquial style and hyperbole of the phrase "There shall not an hoof be left behind." Cf. "Not a dog shall whet his tongue" (xi. 7), and other picturesque colloquialisms in J's popular style; and more especially in the plague narratives: "There remained not one" (viii. 27); "Of the cattle of Israel died not one" (ix. 6); "Remained not any green thing" (x. 15); "Remained not one locust" (x. 19); "There was not a house" (xii. 30). Notice also "until we come *thither*," i.e. to the special place indicated in previous passages as three days' journey distant. Cf. iii. 18; v. 3; vii. 16; xv. 22, and in contrast E, according to whose conception of Israel in the city near the Nile, the journey (to Horeb?) must have been much greater (iii. 12; v. 1).

To sum up, it is not too much to say that every argument which can be adduced, when fairly treated, points to J as the author of the scene x. 24-26, 28 f., xi. 4-8, an unbroken whole which connects immediately with x. 19. What is claimed as evidence for E is evidence for J. Position, connection, language, and subject matter all are on this side, and independent proof for each of the kindred passages (viii. 21 ff., etc.) will be furnished later.

The real E, "rein und unvermengt," is x. 20-23, 27, a brief, simple, compact, self-consistent, characteristic, and absolutely complete whole; instead of a story which, with all its length, compels the assumption of vast gaps both in J and E, imitations of style by JE, or an unaccountable mixing of the characteristic expressions of his two sources, or, finally, as Kuenen has it, "a free use of them superseding his usual interweaving."

The result of this rectification of the base-line by which, since Wellhausen, the critics have attempted to measure off E in Ex. vii.-xii. will be found to be as follows. All the gaps, the mixtures, the free use by JE, etc., simply disappear, leaving perhaps the best example in the Hexateuch of the accustomed simple interweaving of J and E with such painstaking conservatism as to retain for us almost every word. Whatever may be deemed *a priori* a probable course for the redactor of JE to pursue, the phenomena of the prophetic

element in Genesis prove, if they prove anything, that his actual course was interweaving, and not free use, and an interweaving which suggests an almost sacred regard for the earlier documents.

Before I proceed to show this in the analysis of the "mixed" passages above mentioned, it will be well to examine the long passages (vii. 26-ix. 21 and x. 1-11), in which, with only two important exceptions (the passages viii. 21-24 and x. 7-11, already spoken of as kindred to x. 24-26, which Dillmann, Jülicher, and Kuenen (?) attribute, in whole or in part, to E), we have, by common consent, J "rein und unvermengt."¹⁰ To show that the severing out of these passages from their present J connection is unwarranted, I will disregard the proofs adduced for the J origin of x. 24-26, which legitimately might involve these passages, and prove their J origin independently.

Dillmann, who supports the theory that J depends on E, discovers in viii. 16^a (compared with vii. 15) a trace of E not recognized by any other critic. However, in one sense I am disposed to admit the claim. I think the clause "Lo he cometh forth to the water" was supplied by R, in imitation of vii. 15. The reasons for so regarding it will be given in connection with the latter verse. The rest of viii. 16^a does not differ from ix. 13, which there is not the slightest reason to deny to J, and the divergence from the form used elsewhere is anything but unexpected in J. No other reason for attributing viii. 21-24 to E is given than its connection with x. 24-26. Jülicher's (B. p. 89) is the only serious argument in favor of it. Seriously meant, at least, it must be; but in reading it is difficult to take it so. Here it is: "Die Einwilligung Pharaos den Israeliten das Opfern im Lande freizustellen, was einen Anfang einer durch die Umstände belehrten Nachgiebigkeit bedeutete, ist in J ohne alle Analogie, passt aber vortrefflich in E's Anschauung. Der Uebergang von der halben Nachgiebigkeit zur vollen, vs. 24, ist im Text einfach unmotiviert." If what is here said as to the agreement of the passage with E as against J were exactly reversed, and J put for E and E for J, the statement would be precisely true. The passage would be totally unexampled, if not impossible, in E, but agrees admirably with J's representation, and is very far from being without analogy or motive where it stands. The motive is the same as in x. 24 ff. after x. 19, ix. 27 after ix. 25 f.,

¹⁰ Wellhausen and Kittel can, of course, only retain these passages in J, as they do, at the cost of ignoring their relationship with x. 24-26.

and every other instance in which in J, and in J only, Pharaoh cringes before the unmistakable and mighty intervention of Yahweh. The concession in verse 24 is slightly different in form from verse 21, because Moses has just refused to accept that. The passage is without analogy in E, because there the character of Pharaoh, as we saw before, is the reverse of that here presented. He is "strong-hearted," unbending, and there is certainly reason to think that E's conception does not even admit of any colloquy at all between Moses and Pharaoh. The analogy in J is more subtle, but none the less convincing. We have disclaimed the intention of arguing from what has been established for x. 24-26; but a careful observer may easily discover that the present passage has its analogue not only there, but, without exception, in every one of the seven plague narratives of J. There is, in reality, a cycle twice repeated of the three possible attitudes of Pharaoh's vacillating mind. The first time, vii. 25, the plague endures seven days, and Pharaoh maintains a stubborn silence; "his heart is heavy." The second time, viii. 4, he promises permission to go, and simply breaks his promise; "Pharaoh deals deceitfully." The third time, viii. 21-24, he offers to compromise by letting the people go, only not beyond the border of Egypt. The fourth time, ix. 7 (cf. vii. 25), he again maintains a stubborn silence. The fifth, ix. 34 (cf. viii. 4), he again promises permission and breaks his promise. The sixth, x. 7-11 (cf. viii. 21-24), he again attempts to compromise, by letting the men go but retaining the women and children. The seventh time x. 24-26, he attempts once more to compromise, by withholding the cattle, but is finally obliged to yield every point to the letter of Moses' demands (xii. 31^b-33).

Finally, viii. 21-24 agrees as excellently in J's conception as it appears incongruous in E's. This compromising, chaffering attempt to dicker and bargain with Yahweh is just what is wanting to complete J's picture of the abject, cringing, deceitful monarch, by as much as it is unsuitable to E's proud, strong ruler. And with this reversal of his three propositions we have actually reached the end of all the arguments which Jülicher, or any other critic that I know of, has to present in favor of a separation of this passage and its analogue (x. 7-11) from the context in which they stand so closely interwoven.

The whole case for carving out the sections viii. 21^b-24^a and x. 7-11 from J passages in which we have no reason whatever to suspect *a priori* the presence of E, but rather the contrary, since it is unlikely

that E contained accounts of more or other plagues than the five already spoken of, rests upon these exceedingly inadequate arguments. But we have not heard as yet a word as to language and style. What Jülicher, the author of the most detailed and elaborate analysis, has to say on this point strikes one as somewhat extraordinary: "Zweifelloß (!) steckt in 21^b, 22, 23, ein Rest von E, den JE aber ziemlich frei der Sprache J's angenähert hat. Kein einziges Indicium verräth für 21^b-23 eine andere Hand als für das übrige Stück; zugleich für uns eine beherzigenswerthe Mahnung das Gewicht der Formkritik nicht zu hoch anzuschlagen"! — Jülicher, B. p. 89.

For this reason, then, JE is supposed in Ex. i.-xii. to have departed from his usual interweaving to indulge in an unprecedented mixing up of his sources, and not only a free use of them, but what looks like a deliberate endeavor — of course fruitless — to throw critics on the wrong scent, because the *indicia* favor the wrong side. But, since there is no opposition, I will content myself with a simple reference or two which will explain the unconditional surrender of this argument from style and language.

Verse 21 is separated into two parts, by both Dillmann and Jülicher, where no division or reason for one exists. This is, of course, because the first half of the verse bears the too unmistakable stamp of J (cf. vs. 4; ix. 27; x. 16, etc.). On the other hand, Jülicher abandons the whole of verse 24, of which Dillmann demands the first half for E. The last clause it is indeed impossible to deny to J, on account of verses 25, 26, 27; viii. 4 ff.; ix. 28 f.; x. 17 f., etc. But after viii. 4 ff. it is impossible to divide the passage 21-24 so as to omit all the concession of Pharaoh. Jülicher therefore feels compelled to give up all of verse 24, and find a distinction between this concession and that of the preceding verses. But the separation is impossible.

Verse 24^a involves 21^b, and that its successor, and 22, again, its successor. The repeated use of *וּבַח*, as in x. 24-26, is characteristic of J, not of E, who says *וַיִּבְרַח* (v. 1), or *וַיִּבְרַח* (iii. 12). J only uses *וַיִּבְרַח* in one case (x. 9), where he wishes to give a reason why wives and children, as well as men, must go to the sacrifice. "The abomination of the Egyptians" is an expression and a thought which recalls J passages alone (Gen. xliii. 32; xlv. 34); while, finally, the whole point at issue — the three days' journey — and all the expressions employed are such as appear only in passages Jülicher himself acknowledges to be J's (iii. 18; v. 3; xv. 22).

I need not dwell so long upon the passage x. 7-11, which is separated from its present context on the sole ground of its connection with the kindred passages already treated. Here, again, the two supporters of the separation disagree, as we might expect, in their analysis. Jülicher includes verse 7 with the verses which follow; Dillmann begins the separation with verse 8. Jülicher is right in recognizing that verse 7 cannot be separated from verse 8, to which it obviously stands in the relation of cause to effect. The separation leaves verse 7 without a result and verse 8 without an occasion. On the other hand, Dillmann is undoubtedly right in recognizing its J origin from the language, in which he points out the use of עִבֵּר with יָדוּהָ, and the expression "be a snare unto us," occurring in xxiii. 33 (J or J E). An expression which strikes me as no less significant is in the last clause, the colloquial hyperbole אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, reminding one strongly of the parallel expression "The land of Egypt was destroyed" (שָׁחָה), viii. 20. The upshot is that verse 7 *and* the following verses are J's.

Dillmann must indeed have forgotten that this use of עִבֵּר with יָדוּהָ was characteristic of J and not E, for in verses 8-11 it occurs *twice*. It seems to me, also, at least doubtful whether an author who had put the language of v. 2 in Pharaoh's mouth would afterward have made him use the expression of x. 10: "So be *Yahweh* with you."

Since it is not claimed that x. 7-11 presents any marks of E, the attempt to separate it from its present J context must be regarded as unwarranted, especially as the advocates of separation cannot agree upon their line of division.

But because there is no trace of E in vii. 26-ix. 21, nor in x. 1-11, it does not follow that J is here pure and unmixed. On the contrary, it is susceptible of absolute demonstration that editorial interpolations have been made; and the only question, which is not of great importance, is as to the more or less.

We may classify as didactic or Deuteronomic: viii. 6^b, "That thou mayest know that there is none like unto *Yahweh* our God"; and 18^b, "To the end thou mayest know that I am *Yahweh* in the midst of the earth"; and ix. 14^b-16, "That thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth. For now I had put forth my hand and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, and thou hadst been cut off from the earth; but in very deed for this cause have I made thee to stand, for to shew thee my power, and that my name may be de-

clared throughout all the earth." These pious additions are not worth wasting much powder on. They are hacks of a small hatchet at fallen Pharaoh "ad majorem Dei gloriam." They bespeak an anxiety for the spread of Yahweh's fame in foreign lands which seems to me foreign to the strict nationalism of J's religious ideas; but if any one thinks differently, let him keep them; xi. 7^b may perhaps serve as a support for their originality, or perhaps be discarded with them. In the case, however, of the longest one, ix. 14^b-16, Dillmann and Wellhausen have claimed that it probably interrupts and destroys the true connection of 14^a with 17. "For I will send all my plagues, etc. . . if thou makest thyself a wall [or dyke] against my people." This question may be left to grammarians. The linguistic argument is best presented by Jülicher. "Manches anstössige ist in 14-16. Schon **בַּסֵּעִם הַזֵּאת הַיָּאֵה אֶת־פַּלְמֵי־מִצְרַיִם** שלח אצל-פלמ-מצרי, fällt auf; 14^a fällt auf; 14^b weist ohne weiteres auf R, vii. 17; viii. 6, 18; ix. 29; ob **לִמְצַן** oder **בְּצִבּוֹר** macht keinen Unterschied. 14^b und erst recht 29^b **לִמְצַן תֵּרַע כִּי לִיהוּה הָאֵלֶּיךָ** sind auf deuteronomische Anschauungen und Theologumene gegründete Phrasen.

The interpolation of ix. 19-21 belongs in the same category of didactic or Deuteronomic redaction, but has a more definite object, viz. to relieve the apparent cruelty of the stroke immediately following. The sending of a deadly hail upon the inoffensive husbandmen and cattle of Egypt, without warning or provocation, seemed to the interpolator altogether too shocking; hence the expedient for showing that none but presumptuous defiers of Yahweh's word were made to suffer. A parallel case is Gen. xviii. 23-32, wherein the wholesale slaughter of Sodom and Gomorrha is justified. Wellhausen's proof of the interpolation of these verses of Genesis is very complete. Ex. ix. 19-21 was interpolated after the union of J and E; for, while it paves the way for verse 22 (undeniably E's), it is attached to the substance of 13-18. But it cannot belong to J, because, according to J, the cattle it seeks to protect are all dead already (cf. ix. 6). Again, regard for the word of Yahweh in J must entail a letting of the people go, or intercession on the part of Pharaoh's servants, like x. 7. But neither can it belong to E, for it is made an integral part of J's address of warning to Pharaoh.

Since we are now considering these Deuteronomic interpolations, we may include also ix. 29^b, 30, "That thou mayest know that the

earth is Yahweh's. But as for thee and thy servants, I know that ye will not yet fear Yahweh Elohim," remarks which are quite uncalled for, if not inappropriate, on Moses' part, besides making the connection of verse 31 excessively awkward. The same applies to it as to viii. 6^b, 18^b.

Finally, x. 1^b-3, **וַיִּשָּׂא**, is a most unmistakable instance of the Deuteronomist's hand. The first clause, "I have made heavy," etc., is contrary to J's usage, in which Pharaoh invariably makes his own heart heavy (viii. 28; ix. 34), and **אֲנִי** is Deuteronomic. "That I might show these my signs" is the familiar sermonic style of this writer. Verse 2 loses the rôle entirely in its anxiety to impress a lesson upon present-day Hebrews. The "thou," which according to verse 1 should be Moses, is evidently a pulpit "thou," addressed to the representative Israelite, as in Ex. xiii. 3-16 *passim*, and throughout Deuteronomy. The lesson itself, which is the characteristic one of perpetuating the remembrance to children's children of Yahweh's doings (cf. xiii. 8 f., 14 f., 16, etc.), leads the author so far out of the situation that Yahweh appears in the last clause of verse 2 addressing to Moses, or Moses and Aaron, the language, "That *ye* may know that I am Yahweh." Finally, the first clause of verse 3 is an instance unparalleled in J of a statement of the carrying out of the instructions given, and, as a result of its being introduced, Moses and Aaron appear going in and delivering a long message to Pharaoh before they have received any to deliver; for Yahweh has gotten no farther with the customary instructions than to say merely, "Go in unto Pharaoh." It is obvious that what really followed was, "and say (**אָמַרְתָּ** instead of **וַיֹּאמְרוּ**) unto him," etc. In thus disposing of x. 1^b-3a α, I have the support of all the critics; in the case of ix. 14-16, Dillmann, Jülicher, Kuenen, and Wellhausen — the last-named for verse 14 only; in the case of ix. 19-21, Jülicher and Kuenen; in the case of viii. 6^b, 18^b; ix. 29^c, 30, Jülicher and Kuenen for the most part.

To the latest redaction may be attributed the introduction of Aaron, who has nothing to do in either J or E, and is totally ignored by Moses (cf. viii. 4, Moses and Aaron, with 5, Moses alone; 8^a with 8^b; 21 with 22, 25, 26). In fact, the only cases in which Aaron appears at all, are where Pharaoh calls for Moses *and Aaron* (once, x. 8, "Moses and Aaron were brought"), and then during the interview Moses speaks and acts as if there were no Aaron, and after it goes away, except in one case, without him. Even Pharaoh forgets

Aaron in x. 24. All critics agree that Aaron must go. Also we may attribute to R the clause viii. 16, "Lo, he cometh forth to the water," already spoken of, and ix. 35, "As Yahweh had spoken by Moses," borrowed from P's formula.

With the exceptions noted, vii. 26–ix. 21 and x. 1–11 is purely J's, a connection unbroken save by the displacement of a clause like וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה כֵּן מָחָר ("and Yahweh did so on the morrow") by P's account (viii. 1–3).

I turn now to a conscientious, detailed analysis of the three plague narratives which, from their mixed character and conflicting representations, give evidence of incorporations from E. When this analysis is complete, we shall be in a better position to judge of the condition in which the document has reached us. So far we have one of his narratives perfect, complete, and unbroken, in x. 21–23, 27. Let us see what can be rescued from the conglomeration Ex. vii. 14 ff. Chap. xvii. 5 f. (E's because of "Horeb") proves that E related the smiting of the river by *Moses* with the rod. Now no passage of J's throughout the plague chapters alludes to any rod, so that, with what we know of E's practice, even if we must needs assign iv. 1–9 to J, which I think I can show is at least doubtful, we should be justified in suspecting that the rod elements of J E's first plague were derived solely from E. Add, now, the incompatibility of these rod elements with their present J E connection (cf. vii. 17^a with 17^b, and 20^b, xvii. 5 f., with vii. 25), independently shown in each case where they appear (see pp. 164 f.) in the passages called "mixed," and critical proof of the *prima facie* grounds of analysis cannot be more complete.

On this basis, verse 17^b from וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה on, and verse 20 from וַיִּרְאֵם on, which are related clauses, must be given to E. The clause "In the sight of Pharaoh and in the sight of his servants" cannot be excepted, as it belongs of course to the representation which appeals to the eye, i.e. smiting with the rod. So far I agree with all the critics. The last clause of verse 15 is a command to Moses to take in his hand the rod which was turned to a serpent. All the critics except Wellhausen, who gives no particular notice to this verse, maintain that this is an interpolation of J E (not of R, because R would have followed the analogy of vii. 8–13, and written וַיִּקַּח). But I fail to find any other reason given than that the critics themselves assign the passage iv. 1–9, to which reference is made, to J, and hence are embarrassed by the clause. This is manifestly an insufficient reason. Until a better one

is found, or at least until iv. 1 ff. is absolutely proved to be J, the clause will have to be retained as E's. The rest of verse 15 is also assigned by Dillmann to E, on the ground that the directions to Moses for meeting Pharaoh differ from the usage of J as illustrated in vii. 26; ix. 1; and x. 1. In this he is not supported by any other critic. But let us go slow. One clause at a time where there is such minute interweaving. The clause preceding that just assigned to E has the *prima facie* evidence of present connection. Of this it is true that J's formula elsewhere presents no analogy to it; viii. 16^{ab} and ix. 13, both J's, also differ from the formula, "Go in unto Pharaoh," vii. 26; ix. 1; and x. 1, but they neither of them contain this clause; whereas, on the other hand, the manifest object of standing on the brink of the river is in order to smite it with the rod. Verse 15^c must go with 15^a. The clause next preceding, "Lo he goeth out unto the water," is indeed demanded, or something similar to it, by 15^c. But it might equally well be J's, and the corresponding clause of E have been dropped. In favor of this, we have the *prima facie* evidence of the same clause occurring once in J (viii. 16). But does it belong there? I have already suggested assigning it to R — the addition of some one who thought that Moses when told to stand before Pharaoh would not know where to go unless told where he would be likely to meet him, and so supplied the clause from the previous case in which Moses was directed to "stand and meet" the king. In support of this I would urge (1) the analogy of ix. 13, which is identical with this passage, with the omission of the clause in question. (2) That the meaning of the previous clause "Stand before Pharaoh" is not "Go out to meet him" at some designated spot, but is to be understood from the analogy of vii. 26; ix. 1: x. 1, and particularly ix. 13. In other words, it means, Stand in Pharaoh's audience chamber (cf. x. 11^b), and is wrongly explained in the clause, "Lo, he cometh forth unto the water." (3) By attributing this clause in viii. 16 to R, a difficulty of the commentators is removed, who find it very hard to explain why Pharaoh should be coming down to the water either every morning or every two or three mornings. The explanation is, he did n't. The "Lo, he goeth out unto the water" is in its place in vii. 15, and there only, and is there in order that Pharaoh may have a chance to see the smiting. It is a coincidence, but no more surprising, to say the least, than iv. 14, "Lo, he cometh forth to meet thee," to which it is precisely analogous. Lastly,

the meeting of Pharaoh at the river brink is presupposed by the clause "in the sight of Pharaoh and his servants," verse 20. As all the other instances of Yahweh's directions to Moses in J have simply "Go in unto Pharaoh," or "Stand before Pharaoh," it is safe to say that it is only in E that the open-air meetings are arranged. As a matter of fact, E's representation demands it (viz. the smiting, pointing to heaven, etc., with the rod), whereas J's, in which Moses acts the part of Yahweh's ambassador, is more appropriate to the audience chamber. Hence vii. 15^b belongs with clauses ^c and ^d. Finally clause ^a is different from any employed in J's narratives, and in the absence of reasons for breaking the present connection, may safely be assigned to E. Hence I think Dillmann is right, as against the other critics, in assigning 15^{a b c} to E, but wrong, in company with the rest, in summarily rejecting 15^d, and especially wrong in arguing from the illusory resemblance of 15^{a b} to viii. 16 for the presence of E in the latter verse.

One more verse may certainly be attributed to E, viz. verse 23. On the ground of its correspondence to verse 15, Dillmann declares this verse to be "E's for substance, J's for form"¹¹ which means that he thinks J wrote it on the basis of E's facts, though why J should take the pains to alter the language of so simple a statement of facts is not apparent. Further, the only reason adduced for considering the form to be J's is the וַיִּשְׁמַע; the second reference furnished being Ex. xxxii. 15, a passage assigned by all other critics to E. Dillmann's reason for recognizing the substance of this verse as E's might perhaps be regarded as sufficient, after the reasons we have just given confirming his assignment of verse 15, though the other critics assign it to J. I myself have expressed the opinion that J's interviews between Moses and Pharaoh take place indoors, and have presented some evidence for it. This, of course, would exclude verse 23 from J. But I do not rely either upon this or upon Dillmann's argument. Verse 23 is E's for the reason that it refers to something which has happened calculated to produce a powerful effect on Pharaoh's mind. But in J nothing has happened, or at least nothing to warrant the expression, "Neither did he lay even this to heart." This is not the period of distress in J. Moses has simply announced that Yahweh is going to smite the river; if the analogy of the other plagues was followed here, it was "on the morrow" (cf. viii. 19; ix. 5, 18; x. 4). Cer-

¹¹ *Ex. und Lev.* p. 72.

tainly Yahweh had done nothing during the course of Moses' interview with Pharaoh; and to say that Pharaoh turned and went into his house and did not lay even this to heart, and *afterwards* tell of the distress which came on seven days succeeding, is simply absurd. Verse 23 is a conclusion to the narrative, telling the result of some "sign" upon Pharaoh's heart, and is the analogue of "And the heart of Pharaoh was strong, and he did not let the children of Israel go," which concludes the other E sections. It certainly is not time yet in J's narrative to be told the effect on Pharaoh's heart, when we have yet to learn (verses 24 f.) of the suffering caused by the plague. The event to which verse 23 refers is something sudden and immediate, which has occurred between the time of Pharaoh's going forth to the water and his returning to his house. In J the event does not, and from the form of his narrative cannot, take place at once. It is only in E that there is a sudden, immediate, visible stroke. Verse 23 is therefore the concluding sentence of E's account.

Beside these portions, there is absolutely nothing else in vii. 14-25 which can belong to E. All the critics add various other portions, including the whole or part of verses 16, 18, 21^a, 24, and 25, but quite without adequate reason. As a general rule, no more should be withdrawn from the 'Hauptbericht' (here J) than there is reason for. For every word so far assigned reason has been given; for more there is none. x. 21-23, 27 should lead us to expect but the simplest, unadorned narrative. But besides this, the elements already severed out as E's will appear, when connected together, not only to present an almost unbroken and complete whole, but really by their characteristics to exclude the other portions of JE. Finally, I expect to show by independent proof that the rejected parts are indispensable and characteristic portions of J. Here are the portions already won for E:

"Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning: lo, he goeth out unto the water; and thou shalt stand by the river's brink to meet him; and the rod which was turned to a serpent shalt thou take in thine hand. [And thou shalt smite] with the rod that is in mine [read "thine"] hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And he lifted up the rod and smote the waters that were in the river, in the sight of Pharaoh and in the sight of his servants; and all the waters that were in the river were turned to blood. And Pharaoh turned and went into his house, neither did he lay even this to heart."

With the exception of the supplying of the one word, וַיַּחֲבִיטָהּ, necessarily displaced by J's וַיַּחֲבִיטָהּ, and the accompanying change of the possessive pronoun from second to first person, can any one suggest a way in which this paragraph can be made more complete, more self-consistent, or more graphic? To be sure, the opening words of address to Moses are wanting; but they are not far off, and far more easily found than you would suppose. Just drop out the intrusive P elements (vi. 2–vii. 13), and you have them right in their place, following Pharaoh's refusal of Yahweh's demand, and connecting chap. v. with the plague narratives. They are found in vi. 1. The verse is generally attributed to R, because where it now stands it appears superfluous; but I think I shall show reasons, when considering chap. v, for attributing it to E. This author's narrative runs, then, in this way: "And Yahweh said unto Moses, Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh; for by a strong hand shall he let them go, and by a strong hand shall he drive them out of his land. Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning; lo, he goeth out unto the water," etc. It is characterized by the same remarkable brevity and simplicity as x. 21–23, 27, and contains not a superfluous word.

But have we not excluded something which, although not necessary to the story, is really E's, as the critics declare, e.g. verse 18, which seems to follow in good order upon verse 17? No; verse 18 and its correlates 21 and 24 are excluded by the E narrative on the one side, and exhibit characteristics of J on the other.

1. Verse 23, relating the effect upon Pharaoh, can only come at the end of the account of the plague. Its present position before verse 24, therefore, excludes this verse from E. Position is not a matter to be so lightly accounted of as some critics, especially Dillmann, would seem to think. Verses 18^b, 21^b, and 24 are inseparable; and 18^a and 21^a are related to the second half of those verses as cause to effect.

2. i. 22; ii. 1–10; iii. 21 f.; x. 23, and xi. 1–3 show that in E's conception the Hebrews live intimately intermingled with the Egyptians, often sharing the same house (iii. 22), beside the same river, and of course dependent upon it for their water supply equally with the Egyptians. On the other hand, x. 23^b shows that he was not thoughtless of the effect of his plagues upon the Hebrews. Can we suppose that this writer would detail at length the great distress of the Egyptians for water, and leave it to be inferred that Israel suffered

equally? It is at least more reasonable to regard J as the author of these correlated verses, since Gen. xlv. 10; xlv. 28, 29, 34; xlvii. 1, 4, 6^b, 27^a; 1. 8; Ex. viii. 18; ix. 26, and several other passages, conclusively show that he regarded Israel as living in the land of Goshen, away from the Egyptians, and certainly not dependent upon the Nile for their water supply. I anticipate the reply: "But the changing of the water to blood would have the same effect." No, not necessarily. The duration of the phenomenon is what causes the distress, and there is nothing in E to show that he thought of anything more than an immediate but temporary phenomenon, very impressive to the eye of Pharaoh and his servants, — and perhaps to the eye only, — but causing no lasting inconvenience after he had turned and gone into his house. Even if the effect were the same, it is a very different matter to go into a detailed description of the distress, from merely leaving the matter of possible consequences altogether out of the question.

3. The dying of the fish, the consequent stinking of the water, the further consequence of the Egyptians' loathing, the still further consequence of their thirst, and digging round about the river, especially the seven days' water-famine, are all elements incompatible with the representation which requires by its very nature that the sign shall appear immediately. E's account leaves no time for all this. It is all over by the time Pharaoh turns and goes into his house. There is, therefore, nothing else which can find a place in E.

Let us turn to the remaining portions. All the critics recognize verse 14 as J's. "Pharaoh's heart is *heavy*" is the exclusive peculiarity of J, and occurs in every plague narrative. No other word than כָּבֵד is employed by him. "Refuse to let the people go" is equally characteristic (cf. vii. 27: ix. 2, 17; x. 4). Where J says, "let *the people* go," E says uniformly, "*children of Israel*" (ix. 35; x. 20). Verse 16 describes a message to Pharaoh which in E, after v. 4, would be unexampled, if not impossible; but, besides this, every word is characteristic of J. "Yahweh the God of the Hebrews" is regular in J (v. 3; ix. 1, 13; x. 3); whereas E says, "God of Israel" (v. 1); "serve me," as already noted, and "serve me in the wilderness," are regular in J (iii. 18; v. 3; vii. 26, 16, 23; ix. 1, 13; x. 3, 7-11, 24-26; xii. 31^b, 32); whereas, after the single demand, v. 1, the controversy as to whether Israel may or may not go and sacrifice in the desert is abandoned by E. "Hitherto thou hast not hearkened" is also characteristic (cf. ix. 17; x. 3).

Verse 17^a to מָכַח, which continues the address to Pharaoh, is of course proved to be J's by verse 25, in contradiction to verse 20^b and xvii. 5, and corresponds to vii. 27; viii. 17, etc. The phrase "In this thou shalt know that I (אֲנִי) am Yahweh" is superfluous and probably Deuteronomic. It may be rejected or not. Verse 18 and its correlates, as already shown, must go with the accounts (J) in which Yahweh takes his own time to bring to pass the plague. In addition, note that the "stinking" of the river matches the "stinking" of the land (viii. 10), and that words and figures of this coarser kind are far more frequent in J's colloquial, popular language than in E (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 30; Ex. v. 21). Proof that verse 25 belongs to J is needless. It supplies to us the one word (אֶרֶץ-יִרְאָה) now missing from the address. Connected together, the fragments just verified read as follows:

"And Yahweh said unto Moses, Pharaoh's heart is heavy, he refuseth to let the people go. [Supply בָּא אֶל פַּרְעֹה (vii. 26 [viii. 1]; ix. 4; x. 1), Go in unto Pharaoh], and say unto him, Yahweh, the God of the Hebrews, hath sent me unto thee, saying, Let my people go that they may serve me in the wilderness; and behold, hitherto thou hast not hearkened. Thus saith Yahweh, Behold, I will smite [Supply אֶת-יִרְאָה (verse 25), the river], and the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink; and the Egyptians shall loathe to drink water from the river [Supply יִרְאָה יָבֵשׁ יָבֵשׁ: יִרְאָה (viii. 19 f. and verse 25). By to-morrow shall this sign be. And Yahweh did so]. And the fish that was in the river died; and the river stank; and the Egyptians could not drink water from the river. And all the Egyptians digged round about the river for water to drink; for they could not drink of the water of the river. And seven days were fulfilled after that Yahweh had smitten the river."

What is missing here? The seven words now lacking are all supplied with positive certainty by the context. Is there any need of supposing great gaps in both J and E, as Dillmann does, or of maintaining with other critics that J E has departed here from his ordinary method of simple interweaving?

It may seem to many critics a bold analysis which suggests that J never told of any changing of waters to blood at all, but only a "smiting the river" by Yahweh, resulting in a destruction of aqueous life, as Yahweh "smites the first-born" (xii. 29) and they die. But

if iv. 9 be J's, is it not more likely that J related the changing of water to blood a single time, as one of the signs worked before the people, than that he told it twice over — once as a sign, and once as a plague?

We take up next the elements incompatible with the 'Hauptbericht' in ix. 22 ff. After what has been already said, there can be no doubt that 22, 23^{a b} belong to E. Not quite without exception, however, for, although none of the critics seem to have noticed it, the clause "and upon every herb of the field" has been added by the redactor in verse 22, for completeness' sake. In 25^a, where the fulfilment of the threat is found, the clause is missing; but the decisive reason is, that E says invariably *עָשָׂב הָאֶרֶץ*, whereas *עָשָׂב הַשָּׂדֶה* is characteristic of J (cf. x. 12 with ix. 25^b, x. 15^a with 15^b). With the removal of this clause disappears the last excuse for confounding E's account with J's. J has just narrated a special plague, directed solely against the cattle of Egypt, and expressly states that *all* the cattle of Egypt died; and, although Jülicher ventures to reject the "all," it seems to me to have the support of J's usage in almost every plague. The completeness, thoroughness, and unexampled severity of the plague are emphasized by him in every case. "There remained not one," "there remained not any green thing," "there was not a house where there was not one dead"; such expressions as these occur repeatedly, especially in contrast, as here (ix. 6), with the perfect immunity of Israel. Why, now, should J relate, as his very next, a new plague for the purpose of killing over again every beast that was in the field? The answer is unmistakable. The hail in J is directed against "every herb of the field and every tree of the field" (verse 25^b), as we learn both from what is destroyed (verses 25^b and 31^b) and from what is spared (verse 32). On the other hand, E, who has no story of murrain, brings the hail "upon man and upon beast" to kill them, — quite a different kind of hail-storm from J's, — and refers only incidentally in the story of the next plague to the damage the "herbs of the land" and "the fruit of the trees" had suffered from the hail (x. 12, 15^b).¹²

With this clew, there is not a particle of difficulty in separating out the E elements from the story. In addition to verse 22, 23^{a b} there is

¹² Jülicher attributes the clause "which the hail had left," 15^b to R, but though there seems to be some show of reason in this inappropriateness of the clause as appended to "the fruit of the trees," consistency would require the elimination of the same clause in vs. 12, which Jülicher does not contemplate, and for which it would be difficult to present adequate grounds.

nothing to be claimed for E but verse 25^a, which answers to verse 22, and verse 35, which is E's regular concluding formula. Verse 23^c is a doublet to 23^b, and is excluded by it. The latter stands in immediate connection with 23^a, and is, moreover, well adapted in form to E's representation. Verse 23^c, on the other hand, corresponds exactly to J's usual description of Yahweh's "smiting," "bringing a wind," etc., and to the requirement of the corresponding verse in the warning (ix. 18), "To-morrow I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail," etc. Furthermore, the phraseology agrees with Gen. xix. 24. Verse 25^b is assured to J by *עָץ הַשִּׁדָּה*, *עֵשֶׂב הַשִּׁדָּה*, and is, furthermore, a doublet of verse 25^a. Verses 31, 32, though assigned by all the critics to E, are positively J's; not only for the reason that they stand in a purely J connection, without the smallest trace of evidence for any other origin than that of the context, but for the reason that only J regards the hail as an infliction directed against the crops, E against men and cattle. These verses look forward to x. 5 and the plague of locusts as told in J. Jülicher is misled by the expression *קָלַת אֱלֹהִים* into carving out a piece of verse 28 for E; but J's habitual use of *אלהים* appellatively and in expressions of this kind is perfectly well known (cf. *בני אלהים*, Gen. vi. 1-4).

The current analysis of E in this section — E = ix. 22, 23^a, 24^a, 25^b (sic), 31 f., 35 — seems to me singularly perverse, violating characteristics of both language and context. I am at a loss to account for it, unless from the fact, noticed by Wellhausen, that the words from *הברר ואש* interrupt the necessary connection between *יירחי ברר* and *כבר מאד* in verse 24. They are easily accounted for as a harmonistic interpolation to make verse 24 agree with verse 23; or, more simply still, they may merely have been transposed by scribal error from after *אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם*; but this minute difficulty should not be permitted to separate 23^c, 24 from its obvious connection with J (cf. verse 18, and vs. 3; x. 6, 14; xi. 6). Were E's narrative never so much in need of filling out, it would be impossible, without violence to the unquestionable characteristics of J, to separate from the compact and self-consistent remainder a single word to E's account.

But let us connect our fragments together, and see whether, as the critics maintain, "Der Jehovist hat den Bestand von E sehr stark angestastet" (Wellhausen, *Comp.* p. 69), or whether, as in two previous instances, we have not his account most extraordinarily complete:

"And Yahweh said unto Moses, Stretch forth thine hand toward

heaven, that there may be hail in all the land of Egypt, upon man and upon beast throughout the land of Egypt. And Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven; and Yahweh sent thunder and hail, and fire ran down unto the earth. And the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt all that was in the field, both man and beast. And the heart of Pharaoh was strong, and he did not let the children of Israel go."

I see no reason to despair at the incompleteness of this narrative. It does not, indeed, resemble J's narrative so strongly as the heterogeneous structure some of the critics present, but it very strongly resembles E in the two previous instances we have already disentangled. Superficially it may seem strange, but in reality it is only natural that the analysis which gives us E most complete also leaves J most complete. Joining directly upon verse 18 comes 23^c, its verbal fulfilment:

"And Yahweh rained hail upon the land of Egypt [and fire mingled with the hail (?)]; so there was a very grievous hail, such as had not been in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation. And the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field. Only in the land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, was there no hail. And Pharaoh sent and called for Moses, and said," etc., down to verse 34.

In this unbroken J connection, it is unnecessary to point out the specially characteristic features which everywhere abound. I will rather proceed directly to the next disturbing element in the 'Hauptbericht,' the passage where the introduction of the rod has produced such singular inconsistencies in time relations.

x. 12 is now readily recognized as the invariable opening formula of E's narratives. In addition to the presence of the rod, I will only call attention to the use of **יָשַׁב הָאָרֶץ**. The first clause of verse 13, of course, belongs with verse 12, and the rest of verse 13, so singularly inconsistent with the first clause, and marked also by the direct agency of Yahweh through natural causes, by the indicating of the time of day, and agreement with verse 4, is of course J's. As the first clause of verse 14 is made entirely superfluous by the two clauses between which it is inserted, it should at least awaken suspicion. Now 14 a α joins exactly, according to the known forms of thought and expression of E, on to 13 a α, and 14 a β not only joins in the same way on to 13^b, but is further characterized as J's by the expression **גִּבּוֹל מִצְרָיִם** for "land," used exclusively by J (cf. vii. 27; x. 4, 19), perhaps implying a separation between Goshen and Egypt. The rest of verse 14 we have

already seen to be a characteristic expression of J's (cf. ix. 18, 24; x. 6; xi. 6), and both it and the succeeding first clause of verse 15 are assured to J by x. 5 and 6; 15^c, moreover, furnishes J's counterpart for E's plague of darkness. The second clause of 15, on the other hand, is a doublet of 15^c, and is shown to be E's by the use of עָשָׂב הָאָרֶץ, whereas 15^c uses עָשָׂב הַשָּׂדֶה, and is a familiar phrase of J's beside (cf. "there remained not one," "died not one," "remained not so much as one," etc., viii. 27; ix. 6, 7; x. 19; xii. 30). Each separate clause in the mixed verses is thus seen to furnish independent evidence of its origin. The rest of the narrative is marked in every way as J's. Pharaoh's repentance, summons to Moses, begging forgiveness and intercession to Yahweh, and finally Moses' entreaty and Yahweh's interposition to remove the plague by the same natural means which brought it, are all regular elements of the 'Hauptbericht.' Only verse 20 is certainly E's regular concluding formula (cf. ix. 35; x. 27 with vii. 14; viii. 11, 28, etc. "Pharaoh's heart is made *strong* by Yahweh," not "Pharaoh made his own heart *heavy*"). J's concluding formula would be out of place, as Pharaoh in J has yet to make a final concession (x. 24-26).

Accordingly, we have the following as the E elements of the plague of locusts: "And Yahweh said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the land of Egypt for the locusts, that they may come up upon the land of Egypt, and eat every herb of the land, even all that the hail hath left. And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt; and the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt, and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left. But Yahweh made Pharaoh's heart strong, and he did not let the children of Israel go."

I fail to see that anything is missing here. On the contrary, having found E's narrative just as simple and brief as this in every other case, it would be surprising to find anything more. In short, we have now gone through every one of E's four plague narratives (the smiting of the first-born made the fifth; see xi. 1), and, instead of finding them in the state of terrible mutilation and almost hopeless incompleteness the critics would lead us to expect, we have found it necessary to supply just one single word, and that not doubtful, but simply displaced by the same word in the first person instead of the second. Even the order is unaltered.

After the removal of the E elements in x. 12 ff., there are no

alterations and no additions to make to the J narrative. It is complete and perfectly orderly and self-consistent. Every word of 1^a, 3 (from וַיִּשְׁמַע on), 4, 6, 16–19, is vouched for again and again by the preceding J narratives; verse 5 corresponds with verse 14 a a^b, already proved to be J's; and verses 7–11 were shown to belong to this author above (p. 176).

A brief glance at the 'Hauptbericht,' now freed throughout chapters vii.–x. from heterogeneous elements, will reveal a very characteristic structure. Although J of all the Hexateuch writers is least inclined to verbal uniformity, and even seems in some cases to take pains to vary the form of expression in details while adhering to it in the main, yet the general framework of these seven related narratives is very carefully preserved. With minor variations, the mould in which each is cast is about as follows: -

"And Yahweh said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh, and say unto him, Thus saith Yahweh the God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me (in the wilderness); for if thou refuse to let my people go, behold I will smite and there shall be a very grievous such as there hath been none like it, neither shall be like it again. And all the Egyptians shall suffer so and so, but Yahweh will sever between the Egyptians and Israel. To-morrow Yahweh will do this thing. And Yahweh did so on the morrow, and there was a very grievous . . . such as there never had been nor shall be; only in the land of Goshen there was none. Then Pharaoh called for Moses, and said, Entreat for me." Here follows the regular cycle of Pharaoh's different attitudes of mind — sullen silence, false promises, or evasion, varying the narrative, and at the same time admirably carrying out the picture of this craven character. If Moses is called to entreat, the framework continues about as follows: "And Moses said, To-morrow I will go out to entreat, and Yahweh will remove the . . . And Moses went out and spread abroad his hands to Yahweh. And Yahweh did according to the word of Moses; and he removed the . . . from Pharaoh, from his servants, and his people; there remained not so much as one. But when Pharaoh saw that he made his heart heavy, and did not let the people go."

Looking at J's form of narrative in contrast to E's, we see that in J the colloquy is the main thing. In E there is none. It is not even considered necessary in J to state that Moses conveyed the message intrusted to him. In every case this is understood. The warning

itself supplies the description of the plague, which is made minute, detailed, and graphic, and stress is laid upon the severity of the infliction. E is as brief as possible, and gives no attention to description. Pains are taken by J uniformly to assign a fixed date both for the coming and vanishing of the plague, so that there may be no doubt of Yahweh's agency. This is offered as an advantage to Pharaoh in viii. 5, that he shall fix the time himself when the frogs shall be destroyed. In E, the visible agency of the rod makes appointment of times superfluous. In both narratives pains are taken to show the immunity of the Hebrews from the plagues, wherever such assurance is required. In J this immunity is secured by their geographical position; in E, by their condition and by special interposition. In the case of the swarms of flies and the hail, J expressly says there were none in the land of Goshen where the children of Israel dwelt. The land of Goshen, in Josh. x. 41 and xi. 16, is reckoned as part of Canaan rather than Egypt, and belonging to the conquests of Joshua. Gen. xlvii. 28-xlvii. 4 (J) confirms this location, at least to the extent of making it a pasture land between Egypt and the desert, away from the alluvial strip of the Nile. Critics have repeatedly used language implying the suspicion that J forgot his own representation, or at least departed from consistency; attributing to J e.g. passages which imply proximity to the Nile (Ex. i. 22; ii. 1 sqq.; iv. 9, etc.). But as Jülicher justly says of this author in contrast with P, "*Er sieht was er schreibt, und wie er es sieht so schreibt er's.*" Indeed, the genius of the story-teller consists in this power of instinctively avoiding those minor inconsistencies which deprive the story of its verisimilitude. The presumption must therefore be in favor of an analysis which removes apparent inconsistencies, or of an understanding of the author's standpoint which eliminates them by seeing the scene as he does. This sensitive sympathy with the author is the genius of criticism. He who has it will appreciate e.g. that it is needless for J to specify the immunity of Israel in the first plague, since they are not dependent on the smitten river. So, again, in the plague of frogs swarming in the river and coming up into the houses of Pharaoh and his servants, there is no need for the assurance that the Hebrews, who live remote from the river, and are at least in part still nomadic herdsmen (ix. 4 ff.), do not suffer. In x. 5, the plague is limited to that which had escaped and remained to the Egyptians from the preceding plague, hence the same limitation must apply to the one as to

the other (cf. ix. 26, "in the land of Goshen there was no hail"). In all the other cases the difference or "redemption" which Yahweh will set between Israel and Egypt is specially noted by J.

But E also, as we saw (p. 183), was not oblivious of the fact that his narrative required something to indicate that the Hebrews did not suffer from the plagues in common with the Egyptians. Now in the plague of hail, directed against "man and beast throughout the land of Egypt," and that of locusts, directed against "every herb of the land and all the fruit of the trees," there is apparently nothing to indicate that the Hebrews did not suffer in common with their neighbors. Nothing, indeed, unless here also we place ourselves exactly at the point of view of the author. The explanation is, that E nowhere regards the Israelites as owners of cattle, of crops, of flocks and herds, but rather as slaves, like Joseph in the house of Potiphar. This will appear, I know, a bold claim to put forward; but it is not advanced without ample support. Turn first to the contrasted representations of J and E in Gen. xlv. ff.

Gen. xlv. 9 f. gives Joseph's message to his father directing him to "Come down unto me, tarry not, and thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, and thou shalt be near unto me, thou and thy children and thy children's children, and thy flocks and thy herds and all that thou hast." In accord with this, xlv. 32 declares that the men are shepherds, and have brought their livelihood and occupation with them. They only ask permission to occupy the pasture land of Goshen because it is appropriate to their calling, and they have brought with them their flocks and herds and all that they have.

In distinct contrast to this, there runs through the same chapters a totally different representation. Pharaoh, who here knows in advance of the proposed migration, sends word that the family of Israel are to leave behind their stuff, as they will no longer need to depend on flocks and herds, but are to become royal pensioners. Accordingly, Pharaoh sends wagons for their transportation — the train, of course, not including cattle-cars. In accord with this account, they become entirely dependent on Joseph, who "nourishes his father's family with bread according to their families." The contrast is as broad as between a tribe of Indians living on government rations and a company of stock-raisers. Now there is not the least particle of doubt as to the authorship of these contrasted accounts. The cattle-owners are J's; the royal pensioners are E's.

But is this contrast preserved in the further narrative of J and E? We have seen that in the plague narratives J, at least, consistently depicts the Israelites as still dwelling in the pasture land of Goshen, apart from the Egyptians, and as owners of cattle (ix. 6). Even chapter v., which, with the exception of verses 1, 2, and 4, I regard as J's, is no obstacle; since Egyptian archaeology teaches that the method of Rameses II. was to require a certain tribute of bricks from enslaved peoples, without necessarily any further interference with their domestic occupations than the payment of this tax. This is the representation of chapter v., where the Hebrews are under the immediate supervision of officers of their own race (שָׂרֵי בָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, see verses 14 ff.), who are personally responsible to the taskmasters (נְגִשִּׁים) for the "tale of bricks." This organization is adapted to a subject tribe living by itself, but not to scattered slaves intermingled with the Egyptians.¹⁸ Upon leaving Egypt, J describes "a mixed multitude and flocks and herds, even very much cattle, as *going up* (עָלָה) with them." xvii. 3 stands side by side with its duplicate 1^b, 2^{ab}. In the former the thirst of the people *and their cattle* is described; in the latter, the people alone. The legislation, of course, applies to the future, and hence cannot be cited in evidence. Num. xx. 14-21, a passage which, with Wellhausen, I attribute to J (cf. יִרְי verse 15; גִּבּוֹל verse 16; "thy brother Israel"), again mentions the cattle (verse 19); and Num. xxxii., a very doubtful chapter, has very much to say about them.

But parallel with this narrative, so attentive to the wants and vicissitudes of the cattle, goes another, throughout the middle books, which paints the Israelites in Egypt as in the city, among close crowded dwellings. They are in the position of slaves, and not in a condition to own flocks and herds or crops. This writer does not tell us that they suffered no loss by hail or locusts; but might it not fairly be deemed needless? When they "go forth," it is not as a disorderly multitude (עָרֶב רַב), laden with domestic utensils and driving herds of cattle, but like an army 600,000 strong, armed and with an high hand. They do not go empty, but carry more portable wealth. They have spoiled the Egyptians, and are taking with them gold, silver, and costly raiment. Scarcely have they set forward from Horeb, when there is great distress and complaint for lack of flesh to eat, and Moses actually exclaims in astonishment at Yahweh's promise to give them

¹⁸ "Scattered" (v. 12) does not refer to a permanent change of domicile, but depicts the difficulty of meeting Pharaoh's requirement.

flesh: "The people among whom I am are 600,000 footmen. . . . Shall flocks and herds be slain for them to suffice them?" (Num. xi. 21 f.). Has he forgotten the "flocks and herds, even very much cattle," so repeatedly alluded to in the passages above cited?

It is true that the critics seem perfectly ready to attribute to "the best narrator of the Hexateuch" so flagrant an inconsistency; and some find in JE two stories of the quails, attributing portions of Ex. xvi. to J, while others assign some of the disputed passages in Numbers which allude to flocks and herds to E. In no case, however, is there a serious obstacle to supposing every one of the passages so characterized to be J's. This must either be done, or more than one flagrant inconsistency must be charged to the account of the ancient writers.

Taking now into consideration the passages describing Pharaoh's attempts to compromise with Moses, which have all independently been proved to be J's, and in which so much attention is paid to the flocks and herds, it seems to me that the indications of the JE elements in Ex.-Num. point almost imperatively to the conclusion that the contrast in the representations of J and E as to the conditions of Israel's life at their settlement in Egypt (Gen. xlv. ff.), was preserved throughout the story. E's Israel possessed neither flocks nor herds nor crops.

Still another characteristic connected with the contrasted geographical position assumed by J and E is the important clause, frequently repeated, which makes the journey contemplated by Israel a three-days' journey in, or into, the wilderness. By the analysis now proposed, every one of these allusions is found in J. Indeed, they must all come from the same author, unless the reckoning be from some other than the starting-point, for J and E have not the same starting-point. The objective point (Sinai in J, Horeb in E) is commonly assumed to be identical, though I do not know any convincing argument. But wherever Horeb was, Sinai may be looked for at a distance of three-days' journey into the wilderness from Goshen (cf. iii. 18; v. 3; vii. 16, 26; viii. 4, 16, 22-24; ix. 1, 13; x. 3, 7-11, 24-26; xii. 31 f.; xv. 22).

Such are some of the most striking contrasts in conception of J and E which an improved analysis brings to light in chapters vii.-x. One may surely count upon them as clews which will give no inconsiderable aid in the difficult and still unsolved problem of the analysis

of JE in the middle books of the Hexateuch. The present contribution will reach its conclusion when we have taken up the remaining portions of the 'Hauptbericht' and separated from it the few verses of E in chapters xi. and xii.

To perceive how perfectly consistent, uninterrupted, complete, and inseparable the 'Hauptbericht' is, we need only read straight down the column, eliminating only those elements which we have positive proof are E's. After the removal of the locusts, we read in x. 24 ff., in immediate connection with x. 19:

"And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and said, Go ye, serve Yahweh; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you. And Moses said, Thou must also give into our hand sacrifices and burnt-offerings, that we may sacrifice unto Yahweh our God. Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not a hoof be left behind; for thereof must we take to serve Yahweh our God; and we know not with what we must serve Yahweh until we come thither. And Pharaoh said unto him, Get thee from me, take heed to thyself, see my face no more; for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die. And Moses said, Thou hast spoken well. I will see thy face again no more. [And Moses said (?)] Thus saith Yahweh, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt, and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne even unto the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill; [and all the first-born of cattle]. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there hath been none like it, nor shall be like it any more. But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast; [that ye may know how that Yahweh doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel (?)] But all these thy servants shall come down unto me, and bow down themselves unto me, saying, Get thee out, and all the people that follow thee; and after that I will go out. And he went out from Pharaoh in hot anger."

It was a blunder such as the compiler of J and E does not often commit to insert the passage xi. 1-3 in the midst of this passionate harangue of Moses. We have already seen (p. 171) that we cannot have here two interviews, as the insertion of xi. 1-3 makes it appear. In rapid progression, Moses' philippic against the craven monarch advances from its inception in x. 29 to its climax in xi. 8, and leaves no time for the ordinary concluding formula, "And Pharaoh's heart

was heavy, and he did not let the people go." After Pharaoh, in x. 28, has irrevocably cut off the possibility of another hearing, it becomes impossible for Moses to wait for further directions from Yahweh and a new interview. He *must* proceed at once with the warning of the last supreme and personal interposition of Yahweh. In the same form as heretofore (vii. 17, 26; viii. 16; ix. 1, 13; x. 3) he proceeds to denounce (xi. 4-8) the final plague. The specification of the time, the personal action of Yahweh, the emphasis laid upon the completeness and severity of the plague, the picturesque superlative figure "unto the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill" (cf. xii. 29, "unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon," and the hyperbolic expressions of J, "not one locust," x. 19; "not a hoof be left behind," x. 26, etc.; "not a dog move his tongue," verse 7), and the difference put between Israel and Egypt, are characteristics we have met in nearly all the previous denunciations of J.

On the contrary, the last clause of xi. 5, and its correlate in xii. 29, "and all the first-born of cattle," forms a rather grotesque anti-climax, of which I do not think J would be guilty. The Egyptian cattle are already all dead according to J (ix. 6); but the clause is easily accounted for, if we remember the editorial tendency to adapt the story in minor points to the legal requirement ("the first-born of thy cattle," see xiii. 11-16).

With this exception, and possibly that of the words *מִשֵּׁת* *יִי־אֲמֹר*, verse 4, and of xi. 7^b, before spoken of, the passage xi. 4-8 forms a splendid climax to J's graphic story of Moses' contest with Pharaoh. If it affords clear evidence of anything, it is certainly this, that nothing is further from the author's mind than any want of a mouthpiece for Moses or inability on his part to speak for himself, such as is related in iv. 10-16. Singularly enough, this is the one interview in which R has omitted his *וַאֲמֹרֵךְ* in the summons of Pharaoh.

We have already seen (p. 171) how intolerable the interruption is. Of all the critics there is none but Kittel who for a moment hesitates to assign the passage xi. 1-3 to E; and the reason for the exception in his case is very manifest. Having recognized with the utmost positiveness the connection of x. 28 f. with xi. 8, and assigned these verses to E, he has no alternative, unless he creates a new source, but to attribute the interruption to J. He does so, however, with qualms of conscience, as the (?) testifies. His denial of xi. 1-3 to E involves also the withdrawal from that source of iii. 21 f., where

he again finds himself opposed to the unanimous consent of critics. Both of these passages imply in the strongest manner that the Hebrews live intermingled with the Egyptians, even sharing the same roof; and all critics agree that they present the strongest characteristics of E. Julicher expresses an inclination to attribute the passage to J, but acknowledges that *בְּלֵלָה*, xi. 1, and the curious expression *הָאִישׁ מִשֵּׁה*, found only here and in Num. xii. 3 (E) make it impossible. But, beside all this, and beside the conception of Israel dwelling in the city with Egyptian housemates, there is a further implication of the passage and its correlate xii. 35 f. which is both intrinsically interesting, and to my mind makes these verses incompatible with J. After the open altercation with Pharaoh as to whether or not Israel shall be let go into the wilderness, toward the end of which even his servants join their voices to the debate, it surely is not a favorable time for the Israelites to attempt to borrow of Egyptian neighbors jewels of silver and jewels of gold. The time is still more unpropitious, if the frightful death-stroke has just visited Egypt, "and there was a great cry, because there was not a house in which there was not one dead." Let others maintain that our narrators were capable of such a violation of the probabilities as to bring the women of the children of Israel in at such a time to borrow finery and jewelry. I believe that both J and E, when they related a story, had before their mind's eye a sufficiently lifelike and realistic conception of the scenes in the midst of which their characters and incidents are placed, to avoid instinctively these gross incongruities and improbabilities.

But the reply will be made, "Israel does not *borrow* the jewels and finery; they are extorted by force, or at least by fear. So the more confusion, distress, dismay, and terror reign, the more propitious the hour." If that is the case, it is very singular that it should be the *women* who are sent to make these haughty demands (Ex. iii. 22). But this is not E's representation. The articles are not obtained by fear, but by favor. "Yahweh gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they let them have what they asked" (xi. 3 and xii. 36). This is one reason for the confiding liberality of the neighbors; and the second is still more significant, viz. that Moses' credit was remarkably good. "The man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt," etc. (cf. ii. 1-14).

It follows from this that xii. 35 f. joins directly upon xi. 1-3, and we shall only injure the connection and spoil the verisimilitude of the

narrative by attempting to insert anything between. If, as seems probable, xii. 30-33 contains elements derived from E's account of the final plague and the deliverance of the people, they are taken from after, not before, verse 35 f.

We have now to examine the J narrative, and see if any extraneous elements require to be excluded, beside the E passages noted. xii. 21-27, which duplicates (with some divergences) the law of Passover just given by P in xii. 1-20, 28, is recognized by all the critics as belonging to J E. Dillmann alone refers it to J, the rest recognizing the Deuteronomic tone and language. Verses 24 and 26 exhibit the characteristic solicitude for future generations, and the rhetorical "thou." But it is not upon style and language I should principally rely. Verse 22 is a prohibition to the Israelites to go out of the door of the house until morning; of course, after the habit of the Deuteronomist, with the practice of his own day in celebrating the Passover much more in mind than the circumstances of the history. The latter represents the exodus as taking place at midnight; the Israelites not being permitted to wait "until morning," out they were "thrust out" perforce, "and could not tarry" (verse 39).

Again, the author manifestly departs from the representation of the 'Hauptbericht' (Israel in Goshen apart by themselves) and adopts that of E, of a city in which in one house are Hebrews and in the next Egyptians.

There remains, therefore, nothing between xi. 4-8 and xii. 29; and nothing is required. The connection is perfect. xii. 29, 30^b reproduce verbally the prediction of xi. 4-6; 31^b and 32 are assured as J's by iii. 18; v. 3; vii. 16, etc., and viii. 21-25; x. 9, 24-26. Even the last clause of verse 32 probably refers to the sacrifice to be made to Yahweh. Verse 33 seems to correspond with the prediction xi. 8, and the representation of haste forms part of the explanation of Mazzoth which follows. "Kneading troughs" (verse 34) are only met with in J (vii. 28), and the haste with which the homely household utensils are huddled together is incongruous with the comparatively deliberate preparation of E. In fact, the representations are quite different. In E the Israelites take the initiative. They have the advantage of their Egyptian neighbors in being informed of the impending stroke, and, furthermore, that as a result of it Pharaoh will not only give the desired permission to go and hold a feast (v. 1), but actually drive them out altogether. Of all this their neighbors

are in unsuspecting ignorance. Hence, with Yahweh's assistance to give them favor, and the high credit of Moses' name, they begin their preparations by borrowing gold, silver, and costly raiment, — portable valuables, — and stand waiting the signal. In J all is haste and confusion. Between the last plague and the denunciation of the final stroke Moses has no opportunity to communicate with the people. From Pharaoh's palace he hastens to Goshen; but the same night come Pharaoh's messengers, "urgent upon the people to send them out of the land in haste," declaring, with J's popular hyperbole, "We be all dead men." The whole community, with flocks and herds and household goods, are hurried off, unprepared, and half against their will.

The question now is, whether the two remaining clauses, 30^a and 31^a should also be considered J's, or fragments incorporated from E. In favor of the latter, it may be said that 30^a interrupts the connection of verse 29 with what in xi. 5 f. stands directly connected with it. Verse 31^a suggests the more serious consideration of an apparent contradiction of x. 29; xi. 8. Even if possibly וַיֵּרָא מֹשֶׁה might be understood as not necessarily implying the appearance of Moses before Pharaoh, 31^a can hardly be supposed to carry out xi. 8, so that we must at least suppose something to be omitted. Again, the expression מִיָּדָי אֶרְאֶה is more appropriate to E's representation than to J's. Possibly, since R's hand is not quite so likely to be present here, the joining of Aaron to Moses, as in v. 1, might also be adduced as evidence, in contrast with x. 24. On the other hand, verse 30^a is not inappropriate where it stands, and the first words of 31^a are a standing expression of J. On the whole, however, the preponderance of evidence for E is tolerably strong. We may accordingly look upon these fragments as the sole remaining portions of an account, by analogy very brief, of the last plague, foretold in xi. 1, which doubtless followed after xii. 36.

I shall not add to this over-long contribution an elaborate synopsis of results. The results are rather to appear in the further analysis of JE in Exodus and Numbers. Some, which have already appeared with especial clearness, I have spoken of in the course of the analysis. Certain clues which I venture to think valuable have been afforded for further analysis. The conscientious preservation by JE of the material of his sources, instead of any "free use superseding the customary interweaving," has, I think, been conclusively demon-

strated there where of all the Hexateuch it was most doubted — a very hopeful and gratifying result. But the fruits of a detailed comparison of J and E for the settlement of the vexed question of priority and mutual relation, still more of the numerous related questions of historical criticism, we must not attempt to reap from so narrow a field. The next step must be a further analysis in the difficult chapters Ex. i.–vii.